

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 were presented for the examination. New claims 21-31 have been added in this submission. Claims 1-4 and 7-13 have been rejected. Claims 5-6 and 14-16 have been objected to and claims 17-20 have been allowed. Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for identifying the allowable subject matter.

Objections on the Specification

The specification of the disclosure is objected to because of certain informalities.

The specification has been amended to remove the informalities.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C §102(b)

Claims 1-4, and 7-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tonnby et al. (US Patent 6,295,293). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Tonnby et al. do not anticipate claim 1. To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. See MPEP §2131. With regard to claim 1, the Examiner has stated that "Tonnby et al. discloses in Figs. 1, 4, 8, 9, a communication network, comprising: a network node; a first terminal having a first modem (28, col. 5, lines 20-25) connected to said network node via a master communication loop; and a second terminal having a second modem (39, 40) also connected to said network node via said master communication loop ..." (emphasis added). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Tonnby et al. discloses a network terminal and an IP access node. The Examiner has cited a first modem (28) and a second modem (39, 40). Applicants would like to respectfully point to the Examiner that elements 28, 39, and 40 are not modems instead they are network terminals, which provide an interface with an IP access node 24. Further, each network terminal

28 is coupled to the IP access node 24 via its own individual loop, which are then multiplexed by an IP multiplexer 38 (see figures 6 and 8). The ADSL modems 55 in the network terminals 28 are not coupled to the IP node 24 via a common master communication loop. According to Tonnby, "... the IP access server has as many access line interfaces as there are network terminals connected to it." (Col. 5, lines 50-54). In contrast, claim 1 recites that a second terminal having a second modem is also connected to the network node via the master communication loop. Thus, Tonnby et al. do not anticipate claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from Tonnby et al.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and is patentably distinguishable from Tonnby et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 3 depends from claim 1 and is patentably distinguishable from Tonnby et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Further, Tonnby et al. do not disclose a master communication loop as recited in claim 3 instead Tonnby et al. discloses individual access interfaces for each network terminal 28 (see col. 5, lines 50-54). Accordingly, claim 3 is further patentably distinguishable from Tonnby et al.

Claim 4 depends from claim 1 and is patentably distinguishable from Tonnby et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Regarding to claim 7, as stated previously herein, each network terminal 28 of Tonnby et al. communicates with the IP node 24 via its own access interface through the IP multiplexer 38. Tonnby et al. do not disclose a common master communication loop used by each terminal for simultaneous communication as recited in claim 7. According, claim 7 is further distinguishable from Tonnby et al.

Claims 8-10 depend from claim 1 and are patentably distinguishable from Tonnby et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 11 has been rejected in the manner of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 11 is patentably distinguishable from Tonnby et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 12 has been rejected in the manner of claims 2 and 4. Accordingly, claim 12 is patentably distinguishable from Tonnby et al. for at least the same reasons as claims 2 and 4.

Claim 13 has been rejected in the manner of claim 3. Accordingly, claim 13 is patentably distinguishable from Tonnby et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 3.

Applicant believes this application and the claims herein to be in a condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have further inquiry concerning these matters, the Examiner is requested to contact the below named attorney for Applicants.

Respectfully submitted,



Abdul Zindani
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 46,091

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-5137